REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated July 30, 2007, claims 1, 3-6, 10-13 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15 and 16 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added. Claims 7-9 and 14 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

I.　　Claims 1-5 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (USPN 5,892,847).

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite subject matter not disclosed or suggested in Johnson. Thus, amended independent claim 1 now recites:

> A method of processing image data comprising the steps of:
> converting first image data having a first number of bits to second image data having a second number of bits, less than the first number of bits;
> inversely converting the second image data having the second number of bits to thereby output inversely converted second image data having the first number of bits;
> calculating a difference between the information represented by each of the bits of the first image data and the information represented by each of the bits of the inversely converted second image data and outputting the difference as first difference data; and
> generating a file including the first difference data and a first parameter, the first parameter identifying the first difference data as being calculated using the first image data and the inversely converted second image data, wherein
> each bit of image data represents a quantizing level of image data.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite similar subject mater and claims 3-5, 11 and 12 have been amended for consistency with amended claims 1 and 10.

Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 10 do not use the phrase "dynamic range" and instead, refer to the number of bits of the image data.

In accordance with what was asserted in previous responses, the DCT transform disclosed in Johnson is a type of data compression (orthogonal transform) and **NOT** the reduction of the number of bits of the image data (i.e., reduction of the quantizing levels (depth) of the image data), as required by amended independent claims 1 and 10. Thus, independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Johnson, as are dependent claims 2-5, 11 and 12. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-5 and 10-12 is respectfully solicited.

II. Claims 6, 13, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yi (USPN 6,778,187).

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 6 has been amended to recite subject matter not disclosed or suggested in Johnson. Thus, amended independent claim 6 now recites:

> A method of processing image data comprising the steps of:
> converting first image data having a first number of bits to second image data having a second number of bits, less than the first number of bits;
> inversely converting the second image data having second number of bits to thereby output inversely converted second image data having the first number of bits;
> calculating a difference between the information represented by each of the bits of the first image data and the information represented by each of the bits of the and the inversely converted second image data and outputting the difference as first difference data; and

generating a file including the first difference data and a first parameter, the first parameter identifying the first difference data as being calculated using the first image data and the inversely converted second image data, wherein

said step of converting comprises the sub-step of reducing the first number of bits of the first image data beginning with a least significant bit and continuing in sequence from the least significant bit towards higher order bits until the number of bits of the first image data becomes equal to the second number of bits of the second image data, and said step of inversely converting comprises the sub-step of adding ZERO bits to the least significant bit of the second image data until the number of bits of the second image data becomes equal to the first number of bits of the first image data, wherein

each bit of image data represents a quantizing level of image data.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite similar subject mater and claim 16 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 13.

The Examiner contends that Yi discloses calculating difference data of a difference between the broad-range image data and the inversely converted image data as the difference between SOD (source depth) and STD (stored depth). The difference between SOD and STD provides the *difference between the number of bits* of SOD and the *number of bits* of STD. In contrast, amended independent claim 6 requires calculating a difference between the information represented by each of the bits of the first image data and the information represented by each of the bits of the inversely converted second image data and outputting the difference as first difference data. The *difference between the number of bits* for SOD and the *number of bits* for STD is clearly **NOT** a *difference between the information represented by each of the bits of the first image data and the information represented by each of the bits of the inversely converted second image data*, as required by amended independent claims 6 and 13.

Therefore, amended independent claims 6 and 13, as well as dependent claims 15 and 16, are patentable over Yi and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **OCT 3 0 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Marc S. Weiner
Registration No.: 32,181
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorneys for Applicant